DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 468 PS 009 684

AUTHOR Byers, Libby
TITLE On Becoming a "Modern Parent" in the 1920's.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Theories; Child Development; *Child Rearing; *Historical Reviews; *Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Role; Personality Theories; Scientific Attitudes; *Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Freud (Sigmund); Hall (G Stanley); Terman (Lewis M); *Watson (John B)

ABSTRACT

Child rearing and parenting practices during the 1920s, the impact of science and scientific discoveries during this period, medical advances and the concurrent decline in the death-rate of infants and young children are discussed in this paper. Also discussed is the impact of the theories of psychologists G. Stanley Hall, Lewis Terman, and John B. Watson, all proponents of a scientific approach to child rearing. Hall, an evolutionist and a proponent of child study, was responsible for bringing Freud and Jung to the United States. Terman's contributions were the most influential in the measurement movement and in the area of intelligence testing. According to the paper, John B. Watson exerted the greatest influence on parents during the 1920s. His behaviorist orientation was reflected in his emphasis on strict schedules, habit training, and a mechanistic approach to child rearing. Other writers reflected this same orientation. Not until the late 1920s and early 1930s did Freud's theories of unconscious motivation and impulse expression affect child rearing practices. It is suggested that parents were influenced not only by these conflicting theories, but also by memories of their own Victorian upbringing. (BD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148468

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

On Becoming a "Modern Parent" In the 1920's

Libby Byers

40 Newhall Drive

San Rafael, California

(415) 453-2148

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Libby Byers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PS 009684

Science Replaces God

American parents in the 1920's were among the first to experience what is popularly known as the "future shock." Adults had been raised in a Victorian/Edwardian tradition with its ideals of gentility in which the domestic virtues were paramount and respectability was defined on the basis of outward appearances. The denial of sexuality was a major organizing principle of social behavior.

Women had been corseted and layered with cloth and whalebone into a stylized representation of the female form. And this distorted figure was expected to behave in rigidly prescribed ways especially for anyone who aspired to be a lady. The social code was spreading beyond the confines of the wealthy to the rising classes of white collar workers. This careful decorum was interrupted by a cataclysm of a World War I, and a sudden transformation took place throughout western society.

Americans entered the twenties heady with victory and thrust into a position of world power. They accepted their new status as quite naturally due to Yankee ingenuity, vigor, and moral superiority. There was no limit to the aspirations of a nation whose rising technological capability was exceeded only by a rising stock market. The decade was begun in a euphoric haze.

It was a period notable for its infatuation with the scientific method and technological growth. By the mid-twenties, the radio was no longer a curiosity, electricity was taken for granted in urban centers, and "nearly everyone" had indoor plumbing and the telephone. Scheduled air mail was in use, and in 1927 Lindbergh became America's favorite son following his successful flight from Long Island, New York to Paris, France.[1]

Clearly, belief in the benefits of the scientific method and its accompanying technological growth was booming and the early results were promising: mechanical power and technological toys for grown-ups. The accomplishments of science and technology were here to see and use. Victorian rectitude and restraint gave way to a shrill optimism.

But modernity wasn't only a matter of toys and surface opinions, this transformation was so profound that it restructured the way Americans defined humanity itself. Humanness was not so much a creation of God's image, but rather the sum of a person's physical and psychological parts which, it turned out, were accessible to scientific discovery and description. Now, parents could expect their offspring to survive. It was only a matter of time until procedures would be outlined for creating perfect children and exemplary adults.[2] It was a short step from the physical improvement of the child through medical advances to the idea that the child's personality - his emotions and his character - could also be improved if not perfected by the judicious application of the scientific method. After all, the parents of the twenties had witnessed during their own lifetime a dramatic decline in the death-rate of infants and young children. Tables 1 and 2 demonstrate that the decrease in death rate occurred, for the most part, in diseases that affected young children, i.e. infectious diseases of the respiratory and gastro intestinal tract.

The ability of science to greatly alter the death rate as shown in these Tables, during the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, brought fundamental changes in attitudes toward life and death. These shifts were described by Magnus Pyke as:

TABLE 1

INFANT CHILDREN AND ADULT DEATH RATES

PER 1000 LIVE BIRTHS

Decade	Under 1 year	% decrease	5 yrs.	% decrease	44 years	% decrease
1900 ...	162.4		19.8		10.2	
to		19%		23%		12%
1910 ...	131.8		14.0		9.0	
1910 ...	131.8		14.0		9.0	
to		30%		23%		10%
1920 ...	92.3		9.9		8.1	
1920 ...	92.3		9.9		8.1	
to		25%		43%		16%
1930 ...	69.0		5.6		6.8	

Adapted from U.S. Department of Commerce, Statstical Abstract, 1971, (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Censu, 1971), p. 55.

TABLE 2

DEATH RATES FROM SELECTED CAUSES

PER 100,000 POPULATION

Cause of Death	1900	1910	1920	1930
Typhoid and Paratyphoid	31.3	22.5	7.6	4.8
Diphtheria	40.3	21.1	15.3	4.9
Diarrhea, Enteritis etc.	142.7	115.4	53.7	26.0
Pneumonias and Influenza	202.2	155.9	207.3	102.5
Tuberculosis (all forms)	194.4	153.8	113.1	71.1
Cancer and other malignant tumors	64.0	76.2	83.4	97.4
Intracranial lesions of vascular origin	106.9	95.8	93.0	89.0
Diseases of the heart	137.4	158.9	159.6	214.2

Adapted from United States Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1950, (Washington D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 74.

> ...the major change in confidence and understanding that life and health were more likely to continue rather than come to an abrupt, capricious and fearful end, as well as the minor but nevertheless important change of the relaxation of the bonds of family at the beginning and end of life and their replacement by the technical ministrations of paid experts provided by the community...[3]

Furthermore, it was even becoming possible to regulate the number of children parents had and the season of the year in which they were born. To be sure, birth control was extremely controversial - Margaret Sanger was jailed for her efforts to publicize and spread the use of birth control devices. Nevertheless, the possibility of such decisions created awesome changes in people's view of themselves. They were now responsible for life and death in what heretofore had been only God's province. This technological displacement of God was paralleled to some extent by the moral displacement of God by science. The war shook the widespread belief among respectable classes that "God was on our side," and the easy assumptions that the middle classes were the really civilized Christian class of a civilized Christian nation. It turned out that the Saxon enemy was white, Protestant, and respectable too. They prayed to the same God and they lost. Victorian/Edwardian religiosity became associated with superstitions, sentimental attitudes toward children and the family. Science was the new broom which would sweep away the false and dangerous notions of the past. Science could also provide a new moral code based upon truth instead of superstition.

Scientific Child Rearing

Parents welcomed this new ideology. The irony is that they used "science" to construct new ways of parenting which turned out to be as rigid and conforming as the old ways. As one form of rigidity was discarded it reappeared as its opposite. But what was new was the idea of child rearing as the subject of modern expertise rather than tradition or religious teaching.

A different sort of teaching became the fashion. G. Stanley Hall, Lewis Terman and John B. Watson were all leaders of a movement which changed the process of parenting in the twenties. They were among the scientific and pedagogical leaders who spoke for a modern approach to child rearing.

G. Stanley Hall (1844-1924) was the Teddy Roosevelt of the psychological world. He was a torrent of energy and inspiration. His personal magnetism and enthusiasm charmed influential segments of society into realizing the importance of child study. His expansive nature, romantic temperment and claim to a scientific point of view attracted amateurs, i.e. parents, as well as professional. His leadership in the formation of child study goups was significant evidence of parents' growing interest, and later preoccupation, in the psychological development of their children.

An ardent evolutionist, Hall theorized that the course of human development recapitulated the history of the species. Children relive early phases of mankind's evolutionary history: groups like immigrants, Indians and Negroes were said to be a bit behind and should be

let in their natural state of adolescence.[4]

Hall's zest for new projects knew no bounds; he even brought sex tothe correct Americans. In 1909 he had brought Freud and Jung to Clrk University's twentieth anniversary celebration, and with his now faous series of lectures, introduced psychoanalysis to the American inell.gensia.[5] Americans, who during the twenties considered themseves the personification of modernity, were not prepared during the pr-World War I years for Freudian views of sexuality. For parents, aceptance of psychoanalytic views of infants' and childrens' sexuality cae gradually and was fostered after the war by the growth of child stdy groups throughout the country.

But the number and influence of child study groups was circumscibed. In 1920, eleven years after Freud's cordial reception in America, psychoanalytically oriented parent groups were still avant-garde, not in th mainstream of parent discussions. Within a few years, however, the Chld Study Association of American (CSAA) less avant-garde, had an environmentalist mental health orientation which was clearly influenced bypsychoanalysis, In a forward to a book of readings, the CSAA took th environmentalist view that

> ...the child is considered as primarily neither moral nor immoral, but capable of acquiring both a form of behavior that is socially acceptable, and a set of attitudes that are essentially social and moral - or the opposite.[6]

Inthe same foreward:

> His mental health requires not only that he do what he

> wants - and this includes approval by others, affection from others, recognition of his personality, a place in the hearts of his fellows...
>
> Facing the fact that the child has natural impulses that deserve consideration does not mean letting the child do always and everywhere what his impulses drive him to do. It means finding ways for directing his energies into channels that will lead to increasing satisfactions and better relations with others.[7]

But it was not until the late 1920's and early 1930's that the Freudian emphasis on the consequences of impulse repression became a dominant theme in child study groups. There is a characteristic lag between the time a theme is introduced into a society and the time it is incorporated into the ethos of that society. The 1920's preoccupation with scientism took the form of quantifying data, not of de-repressing impulse.

The Measurement Movement

Educators were in an orgy of testing, especially intelligence testing, and Lewis M. Terman (1877-1965) was its central figure. He is best known for his revision of the Binet Intelligence quotient.[8] His interest in intelligence became focused upon children who had unusually high I.Q.s, "geniuses". In 1921 he began a project that continued throughout the rest of his life, and was followed-up posthumously to 1959: His famous Studies of Genius published in 1926. Geniuses, it turned out, were not frail, neurotic and unhappy. On the contrary, they were found to be healthier and happier than their less well endowed

cohorts.[9] Educated parents were told to eschew the fashion of having only two children per family lest there be a "dying out" of Harvard graduates.[10] But at home, parents, confident of their own children's intellectual capacity, did not concern themselves too much with society's collective I.Q. They followed their pediatricians' instructions to the letter; the measurement movement, for them, took the form of careful charting of their children's physical status and behavior. Eating habits, sleep, elimination, weight, height, were conscientiously noted. Such parents were primarily concerned with the health and social behavior of their children, and they neglected, for example, the traditional "careless" pattern of feeding babies when they seemed to be hungry. Modern parents wanted more precise rules: How often? How much? Then, when infants protested these "scientific" rules, parents wondered what to do about crying babies. Should they be picked up? That might "spoil" them. How do you get fussy eaters to finish all that they have been served? What do you do about children who don't wnat to go to bed on time? Or who are afraid of the dark? The questions multiplied. <u>These</u> were the questions that modern parents had during the twenties, and the man who said he had the answers was John Broadus Watson.

<u>Watson and Behaviorism</u>

It is paradoxical that the psychologist who exerted the most influence on parents during the twenties, resigned his post at Johns Hopkins University in 1920 and became an advertising executive.[11] He learned to write what the public would read, and his version of behaviorism appeared in print more than that of any other leader of psychological and educational thought. He has sometimes been called

the "father of behaviorism" although he did not himself lay claim to such a distinction. He was an extreme environmentalist during a period when psychological thought was, by tradition, deterministic and hereditarian, especially so in the work of Thorndike and Terman. Even psychoanalytic thought as set forth by Freud had a strongly deterministic quality, with its emphasis on the unconcious repression of thoughts and events.

One explanation for Watson's influence and his popularity might be that his point of view was more egalitarian than the views of those theorists who attached great importance to inheritance, or the beliefs of the "Social Darwinists" who thought that born incompetents would and should fall by the wayside and that there was not much point in wasting effort and money on basically infererior individuals.[12] Watson, in contrast, democratically offered to take any infant who was physically fit and mold that child into any predetermined adult society might choose. His famous, oft-quoted statment on this was:

> Give me a dozen healthy infants, well formed, and my own specified world to bring them up on and I'll guarantee to take any one at random and train him to become any type of specialist I might select - doctor, lawyer, artist, merchant-chief and, yes, even beggar-man and thief, regardless of his talents penchants, tendancies, abilities, vocations, and race of his ancestors.[13]

This was a tempting promise for parents who saw science as offering unlimited possibilites for their children. Ironically, however, although Watson's philosophy appeared "liberal," the regimen he prescribed to

achieve such ends was not so. Watson's prescription was a strict habit-training regime which he thought would condition the child from infancy to exhibit desirable behavior selected in advance by the adults in charge. All of the child's waking hours, and indeed also his sleep, were to be carefully scheduled. Fears and undesirable mannerisms were to be removed by a careful program to eradicate the unwanted behavior. Mothers and nursemaids were sternly prohibited against displays of love and affection. In his widely known book, Psychological Care of Infant and Child, Watson cautioned his readers to learn the lessons of science:

> Our laboratory studies show that we can bring out a love response in a newborn child by just one stimulus - by stroking its skin. The more sensitive the skin area, the more marked the response. These sensitive areas are the lips, ears, back of the neck, nipples and the sex organs. If the child is crying, stroking these areas will often cause the child to become quiet or even to smile. Nurses and mothers have learned this method of quieting an infant by the trial and error process. They pick the child up, pat it, soothe it, kiss it, rock it, walk with it, dangle it on the knee and the like. All of this kind of petting has the result of gently stimulating the skin. Unscrupulous nurses have learned the very direct result which comes from stroking the sex organs. When the child gets older, the fondling, petting, patting, rocking,of the body will bring out a gurgle or a coo, open laughter, and extension of the arms for the embrace.[14]

This was a grave message to a society that thought itself, in the 1920's, to be emerging from a repressive quarantine on sexual information. The message clearly echoed nineteenth century prohibitions and suggested that Watson was no exception to those who were reared in a Victorian tradition. It did not matter that he was seemingly created for the ethos of the twenties, not that parents of the twenties were attuded to his message; he could not escape the strict upbringling of his own childhood. One form of rigidity translated itself into another.

In answer to the question, "Should the mother never kiss the baby?", Watson answered:

> There is a sensible way of treating children. Treat them as though they were young adults. Dress them, bathe them with care and circumspection. Let your behavior always be objective and kindly firm. Never hug and kiss them, never let them sit on your lap. If you must, kiss them once on the forehead when they say good night. Shake hands with them in the morning. Give them a pat on the head if they have made an extraordinarily good job of a difficult task.[15]

The danger of too much solicitude of the child was adult invalidism, he warned:

> The individual who was not taught in his youth by his mother to be dependent, is one who comes to adult life too busy with his work to note the tiny mishaps that occur in his bodily makeup. When we are deeply engaged in our work, we never note them. Can you imagine an aviator flying in a fog or making a landing in a difficult field wondering whether his luncheon is going to digest?[16]

Watson's instructions to parents were specific and included promise of success; about toilet training he advised:

> Before asking how such unsocial habits (wetting) can be corrected we might ask, is there no way in which we can keep them from forming? It is quite easy to start habits of day time continence (conditioned responses) when the child is from three to five weeks old by putting the chamber into the child (but at this age never on it)each time it is aroused for feeding. It is often surprising how quickly the conditioned response is established if your routine is unremitting and your patience holds out.[17]

Thumbsucking was another habit to be eradicated:

> From the standpoint of the child the matter is serious. Physicians tell us some 90% of disease due to germs find their way into the body through the mouth. The child with its mobile hands gathers germs everywhere.....How can we correct thumb sucking? The answer is, cure it during the first few days of infancy. Watch the baby carefully the first few days. Keep the hands away from the mouth as often as you are near the baby in its waking moments. And always when you put it into the crib for sleep, see that the hands are tucked inside the covers - and if you examine the sleeping infant from time to time see when you leave it that the hands are under the covers (when the child gets older - over one year of age - you will want to see that the hands are left outside the covers when put to bed the reason for which will

appear on page 175).[18]

> If the habit develops in spite of this early scrutiny... sew loose white, cotton flannel mitts with no finger or thumb divisions to the sleeves of the night gown and on all the day dresses, and leave them on for two weeks or more - day and night. So many mothers leave them on only at night, unless the child is watched every moment the hand will at one time or another get back to the mouth. You must be careful to see that the dress or night gown is fastened securely but not tightly at the throat - else if the infant is persistent he will learn to disrobe himself to get at his hands. If the habit still persists make the material of the mitts of rougher and rougher material.[19]

From a parent's point of view such techniques of behaviorism was simple and persuasive: One need not worry about inhibitions and repressions; they did not exist. One dealt with only the visible behavior, and the desired result would ensue. For Watson there were no invisible problems and the only agreement he had with the emerging psychoanalytical point of view was that early experiences indeed had a critical effect upon later life. The unconscious according to Watson was a non-existent construct, another word for soul, which smacked of mysticism and religion, and was based upon superstition and the desire of lazy people to control others by witchcraft, religion, psychoanalysis and other delusions.

Watson's personality suited his doctrine: he was forthright, even zealous. The New York Post said critically that he was "...the

exponent of an evangelical religion, and he preaches it with all the dogmatic zest of Billy Sunday."[20] He was, according to Anglo Saxon standards, extremely handsome, his Bachrach photograph in Current Biography looks intently at the viewer, sincerely, vigorously, almost hypnotically.[21]

Watson's style of writing was in accord with his personality and his looks; it suited the popular press very well. The same magazines that displayed "Pebeco" toothpaste advertisements from Watson's own agency, also published his articles on behaviorism. In a historical summary of Behaviorism, Harrell and Harrison suggest that Watson was more persuasive in the popular press than he was in psychological circles.[22] "He was a persuasive man who was forced by circumstances to leave the academic world and enter into a vocation that used persuasion as its principle too."[23]

Behaviorism Conquers All: The Popular Press

For the most part, middle class parenting during the 1920's meant looking for direction in a post war era. The Victorian traditions in which these parents were raised no longer served in the new age of science so they turned for guidance to the popular publications of their day - the magazines and parent manuals - and they turned increasingly to pediatricians for advice. Both popular and pediatric guidance was strongly influenced by Watsonian behaviorism.

The popular magazines of the day were a particularly ideal medium for Watson's version of behaviorism. In Harper's Magazine where his articles frequently appeared, he defined the behaviorist viewpoint in 1926, as follows:

> The behaviorist viewpoint is just common sense grown articulate. Behaviorism is the study of what people do. What is this man doing now? - any answer to that question made by a trained observer is a psychological fact or happening. After observing man's behavior long enough, the Behaviorist begins to say, "this man or that man will do so and so under such and such conditions."
>
> ...In one sweeping assumption after another, the Behaviorist threw out the concepts both of mind and of consciousness, calling them carryovers from the church dogma of the Middle Ages. The Behaviorist told the introspectionists that consciousness was just a masquerade for the soul.[24]

Freud's psychoanalytical point of view, now being discussed by the Child Study Association of America but no yet widely publicized in magazines that most parents were reading, provoked Watson to remark:

> There was possibly too little science - real science - in Freud's psychology, and hence it held its news value for only a relatively brief span of years.[25]

In its eagerness to further the principles of "real science" the nineteenth century sentimentality of mother love. Elsie C. Mead in the Delineator remarks:

> I can not resist quoting here what we hear so often: "our children would be all right if only their grandmothers didn't spoil them." Some day, perhaps, a prophet will arise whose special mission will be the training of grandparents; for an old fashioned grandmother can prove the greatest obstacle in the path of the young mother who desires to

> profit by modern methods in child hygiene and child psychology.[26]

H. Addington Bruce cautioned against "Overlove and Its Consequences":

> There can be no doubting, though that folly and stupidity vacillation and timidity, are engendered in a good many persons by the overlove of a father or mother, just as delinquency, criminality, and occupational inefficiency are engendered in others. Given a particularly indiscreet overlove applied to a child of the tender-minded rather than tough-minded type - that is, a high strung, exceptionally sensitive child - and it is even possible for overlove to make of a child a neurotic weakling.[27]

For those parents who believed that heredity played a role in character traits, the behaviorist advised the parent to be alert to inherited weakness and to learn havit-training counter measures. In "Never Too Young to Learn Responsibility," the authors say:

> ...in guarding him so zealously from the enemy without, his mother neglected the enemy within....His friends, like his parents never suspected the underlyingweaknesses that, running through his mother's family for generations, had not veen brought under control by an toughening process.[28]

Not only did the popular press worry about too much motherly solicitude and too little vigilence, but the United States' Children's Bureau warned:

> The very love of the mother for her child may be the "stumbling block" that prevents her from successfully

> fulfilling the obligations of her parenthood. This love is invariably associated with excessive worry, anxiety, and, at times definite fear which prevent the most intelligent approach to many problems of childhood.

Harold Cary wrote in Colliers of those times when the job of child management became too difficult:

> Dr. Thom's habit clinics in Boston have shown when out children need outside help, they need the habit doctor... Personality traits which are danger signals (if they are not exaggerated, they may be normal) are excessive day dreaming and make-believe play. Fear, timidity, shyness, and a turning in of the personality should be stopped. Unusual sex manifestations should be looked into. Look out for whining or habitual crying, obstinancy, pugnacity, demands for attention, and temper tantrums.[30]

Jessica Cosgrave charged parents with full responsibility for "The Mind of a Child":

> Children cannot blame their parents for not giving them material advantages or mental horizons that the parents did not themselves possess, but I have always felt that children have a just right to blame elders who do not see to it that their young people go into adult life equipped with all the good habits recognized in the family circle...
>
> When a mother has decided that her young child must get the best possible start in life through a splendid background of good habits, let her sit down with pencil

> and paper and decide which she wishes to teach first. A good rule is to begin each habit a few months to a year earlier than common sense would indicate.[31]

Angelo Patri, whose stance was far more lenient, nontheless adopted behavioral principles. His advice to a mother whose son tended to arrive at school late and poorly groomed:

> Make a program for the day and stick to it. Rise in the morning when the alarm rings and get breakfast ready. Call the boy early enough to let him wash and dress and eat his breakfast properly. After he has eaten it, send him to the bathroom to wash his hands, rinse his mouth and smooth his hair.[32]

Even leaders in the intellectual world wrote on child care. Some saw merit in behaviorism. Bertrand Russell, writing in Harper's, summarized the predominant influences of the times thus:

> Two diverse movements in psychology have led to the emphasis on infancy among scientific students of human nature. The two movements I mean are psychoanalysis and behaviorism. Both are part of the wider movement against the intellectualist theories which formerly prevailed among professors, though never among men of the world.... Psychoanalysis, as one would expect from its origin in the study of mental disease, is more concerned to avoid bad effects than to produce good ones. Consequently, with some of its less scientific students, it has tended towards a new form of the doctrine that the child's nature

> should be left to develop spontaneously, the role of the adult being almost entirely confined to the provision of nourishment and an environment free from dangers. I do not believe that this is the most that can be done with advantage. It is here, I think, the behavioristic psychology shows itself more constructive than psychoanalysis.[33]

Bertrand Russell's point of view was more balanced, but it was also the exception in advice to parents.

A few other writers, Josephine Kenyon, for example, advised mothers of disobedient children to try to understand why they disobey; she asked them to recognize an inner life of the child, a motivational system. Blind obedience was discouraged. "We are only human we parents, and the iron hand in our home may give us the sense of power we have failed to get in the outside world, but it will leave its mark on the child."[34]

In the tradition of the child study enthusiasts, Miriam Scott wrote in 1921 of the value of play. She described the important learning that occurs through play, and she urged that the learning child have an abundance of well chosen play materials at all times.[35]

In contrast, Watson considered play as a sort of recess, not to be wasted, but to be spent in absorbing the health-giving sunshine and staying out of the adult's way. A quiet session with a few crayons was permitted before bed.

Accroding to Celia Stendler, in 1920, 100 percent of the articles concerning children in Ladies Home Journal, Women's Home Companion, and Good Housekeeping reflected a behaviorist point of

view; the burden of the message to parents was more or less rigid; and the alarming tone of much that was printed seemed designed to increase parental anxiety and discomfort.[36]

In addition to the popular press there were popular books. One of the most widely read manuals on the care of infants and children (frequently praised by Watson) was The Care and Feeding of Children.[37] It was first written by L. Emmett Holt Jr. in 1894, and continued to be rewritten and republished by Dr. Holt and by his son until the 1940's; during the 1920's it had six printings. The question and answer format made the text easy to follow and it offered practical advice about the physical care and feeding of young children. Like Watson, the tone of the book was stern and disapproving of indulgence of any kind. Careful feeding schedules were stressed and playing with babies was discouraged:

> Babies under six months old should never be played with; and the less of it an any time the better for the infant... They are made more nervous and irritable, sleep badly, and suffer from indigestion and cease to gain in weight.[38]

Sound advice about health in Holt's book was usually offset by frightening discussions of the consequences of "bad habits" of sucking, restlessness, and nervousness. It was dedicated to "The Young Mothers of America."

The manual most closely identified with the 1920's remained above all Watson's Psychological Care Of Infant and Child, a volume in which the major theme was child management; Holt's book, despite its stern tone was more concerned with health than management.

Watson's opinion of motherhood is expressed by his dedication to "The First Mother Who Brings Up A Happy Child."[39]

A third example of books written for parents during the 1920's is Blatz and Bott's Parents and the Pre-school Child, published in 1929. The general tone of the book was also behavioristic. Day and night, every moment was programmed and sequenced, including the child's playtime which must take place during specified periods that were brought to an end with the careful replacement of toys and the maintenance of an orderly playroom. The actual play activities were subject to clearly defined rules; the child must, for example, learn to amuse himself and not request participation from the adults. Misbehavior in any area of the child's life: thumb sucking, masturbation refusal to eat a predetermined quantity of food, and temper tantrums were carefully charted and a program of correction was instituted.[40]

A book by William Blatz and Helen Bott is interesting because it reflects a joining of forces of parents, educators, and psychologists in the study of children. In the preface, Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg of the Child Study Association fo America viewed the authors as anti-Victorians and stated:

> For some years it has been increasingly evident that parental education is rising above the traditional level women's club activities. For a variety of fairly obvious reasons it is becoming a serious pre-occupaton of women, and of men too, who realize that the commonplace relations of parents and children have much to gain from the re-

> sults of research in many branches of knowledge. It is in the way of becoming also the most extensive portion of the general current known as "adult education."[54]

The text itself, in spite of its no-nonsense approach, appears less simplistic than Watson's. It recognized that unattractive behavior may possibly be symptomatic of underlying needs to which parents should be alerted:

> In general then, call as little attention as possible to the undesirable form of behavior. Mild preventive measures, such as taking the child's thumb from his mouth may be effective, but the more rigorous forms of restraint, such as splints, aluminum mits, etc. are more than questionable. They deal with superficial manifestations, not with the underlying causes of the habit, they take no account of the mechanisms of habit formation or re-formation, they produce feelings of shame and rebellion in the child, and in many cases if they modify behavior it is by displacing the habit only to have it appear in some other undesirable form. Mothers would do well to remember that such habits seldom persist beyond the fifth or sixth year unless trouble has been aggravated in the child by the mother's attitude. If interference seems necessary it should be planned with a view of substituting some more adaptive and interesting behavior for the undesirable habit. Such substitution is effective <u>because</u> <u>positive</u>- instead of merely damming up energy by restraint, it

> provides a new channel for its flow, thereby diverting the child's attention from the undesirable behavior.[42]

Acceptable behavior was not the whole story afterall.

Thus, in a little more than a decade child rearing moved from tradition and the word of God to the clinic and the word of the psychologist and educator. Parents of this era were fully as compelled and zealous as in former generations, but they were without the comfort and support of earlier traditions and folklore of "common sense" and simple truths. "Sense" was no longer common, and truth was not simple. In an attempt to replace tradition with rationality what emerged was a new child-rearing technology. This new practice was usually mechanistically applied and dehumanizing. Child rearing now had an institutional quality in addition to the righticus self-abnegation that carried over from an earlier Victorianism and a still earlier Puritan/Calvinist tradition. By the 1930's the new Freudian approach was upstaging the Watsonian behaviorists. Children's strong feelings became for the vulgar Freudians strong warning of the conscience. Objectivity tried to overcome old fashioned tradition with rationality and modern certainty. The price was to forfeit security of the old traditions, even if they were memories of romanticised "mother knows best."

The most up-to-date parents now were being taught to worry about their children's inner conflicts that were the consequences of the older habit training. To say that parents were in a double bind is to under state their condition -- a triple bind would be more accurate. They were bound by:

1. The behaviorists habit training formula that promised self sufficient children who were pleased to follow rules of good health, good work habits, and the social graces.
2. A vulgarization of the new Freudian point of view that saw the parent's task during their children's early years as encouraging the full expression of impulse and spontaneous expression of libido. The promise was a resolution of repressed conflicts and a release of the true good inner self.
3. Finally, the memory and imprint of the parent's own childhood, which included both the righteous self abnegation of an earlier Victorian/Edwardian age; and the memories and rebellion of the childhood misunderstood and punished.

In the past parents were blamed for not being strict enough, but this triple bind enriched these possiblities and hence forth parents became scapegoats.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Time-Life Books, This Fabulous Century, III (1920-1930), (New York: Time Life Books, 1972), 60-75. One of my own memories of the twenties is of being taken by my mother and my pediatrician to see Lindbergh in a parade celebrating his return home. Within the festive mood there was the assumption that it was perfectly natural for an American to be the "first." And although only the brave or fool-hardy used planes for ordinary travel it was assumed that, in time, air travel would become commonplace. We had nowhere to go but forward; and the quality of life could do nothing but improve. The law of diminshing returns had no set in.

[2]Naturally, one had to have raw materials of good quality, that is excellent genes. According to the Social Darwinists there was a clear correlation between the upper classes and a superior genetic endowment.

[3]Magnus Pyke, The Science Century (London: John Murray, 1967), p. 21.

[4]Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators, (Paterson, N. J.: Pagent Books, Inc., 1959), p. 426.

[5]For a thorough discussion of the effect Freud had upon the Americans, and the difference between American Psychoanalysis and European psychoanalysis see Nathan Hale, Freud and the Americans, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972). Hale describes the Amercians as having a more rigorous code of sexual activity that was sanctioned by marriage only. Thus Freud adapted his remarks to his audience.

[6]Child Study Association of America, Guidance of Childhood and Youth, ed. by Benjamin Gruenberg, (N.Y.: Macmillan, 1926), p. v.

[7]

[8]An I.Q. is a number that expresses the ratio of an individual's so-called mental age to his chronological age, times 100. Thus an individual who is twelve years old, and has mental age of twelve years, is said to have an I.Q. of 100.

[9]Lewis M. Terman, Genetic Studies of Genius, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1926), Vol. I, Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children; Vol. II, The Early Mental Traits of Three Hundred Geniuses, by Catherine M. Cox and assisted by Lewis Terman, 1926; Vol. III, The Promise of Youth: Follow-Up Studies of a Thousand Gifted Children, by Barbara S. Burks, Dorthea Jensen, and Lewis Terman, 1930.

[10]For a history of Eugenics see Mark H. Haller, Eugenics Heriditarian Attitudes in American Thought, (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1963).

[11]Psychology in Autobiography, ed. by Carl Murelison, III (Worcester, Mass: Clark University Press, 1936), 271-281. For autobiographical details see "John Broadus Watson," A History of. Following a divorce that received much publicity, Watson became vice-president of the J. Walter Thompson Co.

[12]An example was William Sumner's "The Absurd Attempt To Make the World Over," (1894) cited in Richard Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in American Thought, (London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1944), p. 40. A comprehensive discussion of

Social Darwinism.

[13]John B. Watson, Behaviorism, (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1924), p. 104.

[14]John B. Watson, Psychological Care of Infant and Child, (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1928), p. 71.

[15]Ibid., p. 81.

[16]Ibid., p. 76

[17]Ibid., p. 123

[18]Ibid., pp. 135-138. Here, Watson says "hands on top of cover" to discourage masturbation.

[19]Ibid., p.137

[20]M.A. Knight, et. al., "Books of 1928, "Book Review Digest, XXIV (New York: H.W. Wilson, 1929), 806.

[21]Current Biography, III (October 1942), (New York: H.W. Wilson, 1929), 806.

[22]Willard Harrell and Rose Harrison, "The Rise and Fall of Behaviorism," The Journal of General Psychology, XVII (1938), 367-371.

[23]For an account of the scandal that forced Watson from the academic world into a career in advertising see "Watson, John B. (roadus)," Current Biography, III (October 1942), 80-82

[24]Harper's Magazine, "What is Behaviorism?" Watson, John B., (May, 1929), pp. 723-724.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Elsie C. Mead, "Good Mannered Babies," The Delineator, CXII (July, 1925), 15ff.

[27]H. Addington Bruce, "Over Love and Its Consequences," Good Housekeeping, LXXXVIII (December, 1928), 92ff.

[28]Arthur H. Sutherland and Myron M. Stearns, "Never Too Young to Learn Responsibility," The Ladies Home Journal, XIV (March 1927), 27ff.

[29]United States Dept. of Labor, U.S. Children's Bureau, Publication No. 143 (Revised Sept. 1927), Child Management by D.A. Thom, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1928.

[30]Harold Cary, "When to Call the Habit Doctor," Colliers, LXXIX (Dec. 6, 1924), 31. This is the same Dr. Douglas Thom who wrote for the Children's Bureau.

[31]Jessica B. Cosgrave, "The Mind of a Child," Good Housekeeping, LXXXIII (Dec. 1926), 46ff.

[32]Angelo Patri, "Give Your Child a Set of Useful Habits," American Magazine, CI (March 1926), 19ff.

[33]Bertrand Russell, "The Training of Young Children," Harper's Monthly Magazine, CLV (August 1927), 312-319.

[34]Josephine H. Kenyon, "Health and Happiness Club," Good Housekeeping, (July, 1921), p. 100.

[35]Miriam Finn Scott, "The New Riches of Play," Good Housekeeping, (Dec. 1921), pp. 18ff.

[36]Celia Stendler, "Psychological Aspects Of Pediatrics," The Journal of Pediatrics, IV (Jan. 1950), 122-134.

[37]Emmet L. Holt Jr., The Care and Feeding of Children, (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1929).

[38]Ibid., p. 210.

[39] John B. Watson, Psychological Care of Infant and Child, (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1928).

[40] Willian E. Blatz and Helen Bott, Parents and the Pre-School Child, (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1929).

[41] Ibid., p. XI.

[42] Ibid., p. 42.